

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In “Preliminary Matters”

Claim 78 is now listed as “canceled”.

Claim 48, the superfluous “at” has been deleted.

Claims 43, 46, 47, 48, 77, and 82, the examiner noted no antecedent basis for “the computer” Original claim 9 cites; “the computer being stationed on the buoy platform.” The previous response on page 20 also listed multiple references in the actual claims and specification which cite a computer performing various tasks and for autonomous operation using computers and is discussed in published application, paragraphs 0007, 0029 and 0036. Original claim 10. (a) a computer recognizes movement within the stabilized sensor image; and (b) the computer sends signals to the stabilizer and/or camera which control the stabilizer ...”

In claims 43, 46, 47, 48, 77, and 82 the examiner questioned what the sensor referred to in claim 37. The correction is that amended claim 37 now recites both a first and second sensor, the “first sensor means to sense motion”, and the second sensor to sense the target. This terminology is now used throughout in amendments.

On page 3, the examiner cites that claims 37, 39, 43, 44 and 80-81 are unpatentable for obviousness over Shields in view of Wilson.

The examiner cites that “Shields teaches a buoy”. Shields does not teach a buoy, and there is no reference in Shields to the word “buoy.” The examiner may have considered buoy and vessel as synonymous, but even if that were done, respondent does not believe that would make Shields prior art. Shields teaches a stabilization method which he describes in his ABSTRACT “Primary sensors sense the position and orientation of the vessel’s center of mass which it uses as a common reference. Secondary sensors sense local platform motion to compensate for positional variations due to the vessel flexing or other localized motions.” Shields further defines his patent in column 4 starting at line 58 where he summarizes FIG 1. “The system configuration shown in FIG 1 is illustrated for the purpose of explaining the method of stabilizing multiple platforms with respect to each other and with respect to common reference.” Shields, FIG 3 shows how this applies to multiple platforms on a vessel, allowing each

platform to aim at a different angle. Shields teaches how to compensate for vessel bend and twist, and how to monitor and correct for vessel bend and twist and the relationships between two platforms under such situations. There is a similar scheme taught in Walrath et al, US 5,050,087, wherein claim 1 begins with: “We claim; 1. A method for accurately determining the attitude of a location in a vehicle that flexes with respect to the said location of a first attitude sensor mounted within the vehicle and having an output by means of a second attitude sensor that is mounted at said flexing location ...” The Walrath vehicle is a helicopter which exhibits bend and twist by virtue of the sensor in the cabin and a second sensor on the main rotor mast.

As to combining in view of Wilson, Wilson teaches a platform with firefighting equipment, however such floating fire engines, such as US Pat# 135,922 from 1873, “Improvement in Floating Fire Engines” have been around for over 100 years. Wilson adds a series of components such as cranes, etc to the firefighting solution, but he does not bring stabilization into the picture. There would be no reason to combine Shields’ bend and twist solution, which is clearly looking at long distance convergence, wherein Grober and Wilson are dealing with “stones throw” distances where convergence is not a factor, therefore there would not be obviousness.

Even the examiner states on pg 3 that; “Shields doesn’t teach that the stabilized platform tool undertakes a physical operation or task...”, taking it further from Wilson’s firefighting barge under any obviousness assertion.

As currently amended, Grober, independent claim 37 is now specific to painting, however other claims do submit firefighting and other operations as tasks. Nonetheless, Wilson and Shields under section 102 do not make Grober obvious.

On pages 4, 5 and 6, the examiner cites various rejections under that claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a), however these all in view of Shields and Wilson combined, and wherein there is no obviousness from Shields in view of Wilson, each of these additional references also do not lead to obviousness.

END OF REMARKS/ARGUMENTS